

REMARKS:

Dependent claim 49 is hereby amended to make it depend from dependent claim 47 rather than claim 41.

The Examiner has required an election (and identification) of claims to one of the following six “species” identified by the Examiner in the office action:

- the “species” shown in Fig. 2;
- the “species” shown in Fig. 3;
- the “species” shown in Fig. 4;
- the “species” shown in Fig. 5;
- the “species” shown in Fig. 6; and
- the “species” shown in Fig. 7.

In response, Applicant elects the claims to the “species” shown in Fig. 2, which are claims 1, 2-4, 7, 15, 17-24, 31, 33, 39-43, 46, 55, and 58-61.

Non-elected claims 25-30 are hereby canceled without prejudice and with the intention to preserve the option to pursue them in a continuing application.

Claims 1 and 31 are generic in the sense that they read on the embodiments of Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Title 37 CFR 1.141 provides that an application may claim both an allowable generic claim and dependent claims (which depend directly or indirectly from the generic claim) to a reasonable number of species embraced by the generic claim. Thus, if generic claim 1 is allowed, Applicant contends that it is also entitled to examination of dependent claims 5 and 6 (reciting a memory distinct from a serial device as is memory 47A of Fig. 3); dependent claims 8-14 (reciting a radiation-emitting element, as is each of LEDs 62 and 63 of Fig. 4), and dependent claim 16 (reciting a serial device configured to execute a verification operation with an external device, as is device 77 of Fig. 5). If generic claim 31 is allowed, Applicant contends that it is also entitled to examination of dependent claims 32 and 34-38 (reciting limitations pertaining to equalization and preemphasis which read on the embodiment of Fig. 3), dependent claims 44 and 45 (reciting a memory distinct from a serial device as is memory 47A of Fig. 3); dependent claims 47-54 (reciting a radiation-emitting

element, as is each of LEDs 62 and 63 of Fig. 4), and dependent claims 56-57 (reciting a serial device configured to execute a verification operation with an external device, as is device 77 of Fig. 5).

Respectfully submitted,

GIRARD & EQUITZ LLP

Dated: 3/14/07

By: Alfred A. Equitz

Alfred A. Equitz
Reg. No. 30,922

Attorneys for Applicants

Attorney Docket No. SII-2700 [SIMG0164]